Introduction

What is the Purpose of This Report?

My aim in writing this report is to describe how Herman Goldstein's problem-oriented policing framework, as I understand it, has been developed and, at times, distorted in the many efforts to make it a standard way of policing. I will not attempt to argue the merits of Goldstein's problem-oriented policing concept in this writing other than to say that I believe in its merits.[1] I try not to declare certain practices "right" or "wrong;" I don't have the wisdom for that. Moreover, it is nearly impossible to know all that is occurring in the name of problem-oriented policing. The field of policing is much too large, diverse and decentralized, so my frame of reference will necessarily be limited. I have sought to discuss those trends and practices that are generally accessible and therefore observable.

[1] *Goldstein has published extensively on the subject. Readers interested in his original materials are encouraged to read Goldstein (1977, 1979, 1987a, 1987b, 1990a, 1991, 1993c, 1996a). I have drawn on his published works, unpublished speeches, notes, training materials, and personal comments to enhance my understanding of the problem-oriented policing concept. A comprehensive listing of Goldstein's writings on problem-oriented policing is provided in the references section.*

My approach to research for this report was to combine personal experience, a review of relevant literature (see References and Appendix B) and problem-oriented policing project reports (see Appendix A), site visits to selected police departments, attendance at conferences, extensive discussions with Herman Goldstein, and interviews of others well-versed in problem-oriented policing (see Appendix C).

Problem-oriented policing is still in its relative infancy. It has not withstood the long tests of time or sufficient critical evaluation. The concept itself could conceivably be proven misdirected or fail to be properly implemented. I intend to take stock of the problem-oriented policing movement, clarify its original principles, encourage promising developments, and, perhaps, correct some distortions.

The specific objectives of this report are

1. to clarify the core elements of Goldstein's ideal model of problem-oriented policing;
2. to describe distortions to various core elements in the practice of problem-oriented policing;
3. to place the concepts of "problem-oriented policing" and "problem-solving" within the context of total police service;
4. to describe the strongest aspects and greatest deficiencies of the move toward problem-oriented policing;
5. to assess the overall progress made by police agencies, governments and research institutions in advancing problem-oriented policing; and
6. to propose directions for the future development of problem-oriented policing.

A Brief History of the Spread of Problem-Oriented Policing

Tracing the development of problem-oriented policing, as with any ideological movement, is difficult. It is hard to say who thought of what, and when, and precisely when a particular idea was translated into action. One often hears in police training sessions on community or problem-oriented policing, "Oh, we've been doing community policing [or problem-oriented policing] for years; we just didn't call it that." Whatever grains of truth there are in such assertions,[2] most police agencies can trace the formal introduction of a concept like problem-oriented policing to a particular time in their history.

The first formal experimentation with Goldstein's model of problem-oriented policing occurred in Madison, Wisc., in 1981 when Goldstein and his associates worked with the Madison Police Department exploring the community's response to drinking drivers and repeat sex offenders (Goldstein 1980, 1990a; Goldstein and Susmilch 1981, 1982a, 1982b, 1982c). That isn't to say that the Madison Police Department was the first to systematically study a community problem, but it was the first to formally apply Goldstein's model. Around 1982, with support from Gary Hayes, the then-executive director of the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), the London Metropolitan Police undertook their own experimentation with the concept (Hoare et al. 1984), as did the Surrey, England, Police Force (Leigh, Read and Tilley 1996). Again with Hayes' encouragement, the Baltimore County Police Department formally introduced Goldstein's problem-oriented policing model into its COPE unit's operations in 1983 (Taft 1986). The Newport News, Va., Police Department followed suit in 1984 (Eck and Spelman 1987). The efforts in both Baltimore County and Newport News benefited from Goldstein's personal involvement and guidance. Both departments' initiatives had some outside funding, and thus resulted in excellent, detailed written reports that more widely communicated the problem-oriented policing concept to police practitioners and researchers.[3] The published report on the Newport News project provided perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of problem-oriented policing at that time, and remains an important and influential document.

A number of other police agencies began to incorporate at least some of the problem-oriented policing methodology into broader community policing efforts during the 1980s. Among the more prominent efforts cited by Goldstein (1990a) were those in New York City (the Community Patrol Officer Program); Edmonton, Alberta (downtown foot beats); Flint, Mich.; Los Angeles (the Community Mobilization Project in the Wilshire district); Houston (referred to as neighborhood-oriented policing); Oxnard, Calif.; Savannah, Ga.; Evanston, Ill.; Tulsa, Okla.; Beloit, Wisc.; and Halton, Ontario.

[2]There is little historical evidence that the police have done the kind of analysis of community problems and deliberate policy formulation envisioned in problem-oriented policing, despite some claims to the contrary. Wrote one reviewer of Goldstein's Problem-Oriented Policing, "The use by police departments of systematic studies to analyze and respond to recurring crime problems is as old as the billy club and the paddy wagon…" (Diulio 1990).

[3]The Baltimore County project received funding from the Florence V. Burden Foundation to prepare a descriptive report and prescriptive training materials. The U.S. Department of Justice's National Institute of Justice funded the Newport News project.

Through the 1980s, PERF helped a number of agencies to replicate various elements of the problem-oriented policing model developed in Baltimore County and Newport News. Among those agencies were the Tampa, St. Petersburg and Clearwater police departments in Florida.

PERF's project to apply problem-oriented methods to drug problems in San Diego, Tampa, Atlanta, Philadelphia, and Tulsa, funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance from 1987 to 1990, proved significant in furthering the problem-oriented policing movement. While some of these sites achieved only modest substantive and organizational success, the San Diego Police Department used this research project as a catalyst to make a substantial investment in problem-oriented policing. The first few national conferences on problem-oriented policing were conceived and partially funded out of this project. The national conferences (the first of which drew about 200 participants in 1990, and currently are drawing about 1,250 participants) have become a major means by which the concept of problem-oriented policing has spread, especially among police practitioners.

The publication in 1990 of Goldstein's *Problem-Oriented Policing* spurred some interest among police agencies, but probably had a greater impact on the police research audience.[4] Police agencies, which acquire knowledge and skills differently than research institutions, were offered some modest, but important, training opportunities in problem-oriented policing starting in 1989. While on staff at PERF, I designed a two-day training seminar in the basic principles and methods of problem-oriented policing, and offered it nationwide.[5] PERF continued and expanded the training after I left.[6] A number of police agencies and police officials today can trace their engagement in problem-oriented policing to those training sessions conducted in the late 1980s through the early 1990s. Even today, some of the training materials developed for those early programs surface in modified form in police training. Through about 1994, PERF provided a significant amount of the limited problem-oriented policing training available, at least in the United States. Since then, much of the training in community policing and problem-solving has been offered under the auspices of the Community Policing Consortium[7] and more recently, the Regional Community Policing Institutes.[8] Many of the agencies that received PERF's training have not significantly incorporated problem-oriented policing into their operations, but a few have, and have made significant contributions to the concept's development, as a result.

Police agencies often resist long-term change, but remarkably, respond to many short-term programmatic innovations. The short history of problem-oriented policing bears this out. At most of the agencies

[4]A number of reviews of Problem-Oriented Policing have been published. Among them are Bayley (1991), Sherman (1991), Das (1992), Vaughn (1992), Mastrofski and Uchida (1993), and Diulio (1990). See, also, Brodeur (1998b).

[5]Among the sites that received this early training were Alexandria, Va.; Aurora, Ill.; Boca Raton, Fla.; Gaston County, N.C.; Hillsborough County, Fla.; Hurst, Texas; Macon, Ga.; Milwaukee; Monroe County, Fla.; New York City Transit Police; Reno, Nev.; St. Paul, Minn.; Suffolk County, N.Y.; and Wilson, N.C.

[6]PERF's training was subsequently coordinated in succession by Rana Sampson, Susie Mowry, Ron Glensor and John Lusardi. Lusardi and Sampson subsequently founded private firms that provide training in problem-oriented policing.

[7]The Community Policing Consortium, created in 1993 with funding from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, is a joint enterprise of PERF, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Police Foundation, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and the National Sheriff's Association.

[8]Approximately 30 Regional Community Policing Institutes were established in 1997 through funding by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to provide training in community policing and problem-solving.

mentioned above, one strong person encouraged the idea of, and certainly advocated, experimenting with problem-oriented policing. Many of the problem-oriented initiatives generally associated with a particular agency prove, upon closer inspection, to be attributable to one or a few individuals. Usually these are high-ranking personnel, although sometimes the lone champion[9] of problem-oriented policing is at the line or supervisory level. When the high-ranking champions leave the agencies, as they inevitably do, the push to engage in problem-oriented policing typically wanes, as well. Many of the police agencies listed in Table 1 experienced the departure of at least one principal champion of problem-oriented policing. These people are generally recognized as having been the driving force behind their agencies' efforts to adopt a problem-oriented policing approach, however long- or short-lived.

[9]*By champion, I refer to someone who makes deliberate study of problem-oriented policing by reading the literature, attending conferences, doing or supervising problem-oriented work, maintaining contacts with others outside the organization about the concept, importing new problem-oriented ideas into the organization, and keeping the concept alive in the organization's consciousness.*

Table 1
Police Agencies, and the Problem-Oriented Policing Champions Who Work or Have Worked There

Police Agency	**Problem-Oriented Policing Champion**
Baltimore County Police Department	Chief Neal Behan (retired), Maj. Philip Huber (left)
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., Police Department	Chief Dennis Nowicki (retired); Chief Darrel Stephens
Chicago Police Department	Deputy Chief Charles Ramsey (left), Director Barbara McDonald
Edmonton Police Service	Superintendent Chris Braiden (retired)
Fort Pierce, Fla., Police Department	Chief Gil Kerlikowske (left), Director of Administration Michael Scott (left)
Joliet, Ill., Police Department	Chief Dennis Nowicki (left), Capt. William Fitzgerald
Lauderhill, Fla., Police Department	Chief Michael Scott (left); Deputy Chief Michele Reilly (left)
London Metropolitan Police	Police Commissioner Sir Kenneth Newman (retired)
Madison Police Department	Chief David Couper (retired), Lt. Randall Gaber, Sgt. Joe Balles
Merseyside, England, Police Constabulary	Chief Inspector Brian Gresty (retired)
Newport News Police Department	Chief Darrel Stephens (left)
Peel, Canada, Regional Police	Chief Robert Lunney (retired)
Philadelphia Police Department	Inspector Ed McLaughlin (left)
Reno Police Department	Chief Robert Bradshaw (left), Deputy Chief Ron Glensor
San Diego Police Department	Chief Jerry Sanders (retired), Nancy McPherson (left)
Seattle Police Department	Chief Norm Stamper (retired), Nancy McPherson (left)

Police Agency	Problem-Oriented Policing Champion
St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department	Police Board President David Robbins (left), Chief Clarence Harmon (retired), Special Assistant to the Chief of Police Michael Scott (left), Sgt. Robert Heimberger
St. Petersburg Police Department	Chief Darrel Stephens (left to become city administrator, now chief in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department)
Thames Valley, England, Police Constabulary	Chief Constable Charles Pollard, Chief Inspector Caroline Nicholl (left)
Tulsa Police Department	Chief Drew Diamond (left), Maj. Carolyn Kusler (left)

In 1994, the U.S. Department of Justice created the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, known more informally as the COPS Office. The Justice Department created this agency primarily to oversee the federal funding of 100,000 new U.S. police officer positions. The COPS Office linked the position funding to the broad concept of community policing, of which problem-solving was a key element.[10] Thus, Goldstein's problem-oriented policing model was linked to an enormous federal funding scheme. The COPS Office was required by law to advance community policing generally, but outside of a few of its competitive funding programs, most of its large funding programs did not require that recipient police agencies engage more specifically in problem-oriented methods. The largest COPS Office program to directly fund problem-solving projects, as opposed to just funding community police officer positions, is the Problem-Solving Partnerships (PSP) Program. Four hundred seventy police agencies received funding to help them identify, analyze, address, and evaluate a specific substantive community crime or disorder problem.[11] Similarly, the School-Based Partnership Grant Program funds problem-solving methods in schools.[12] While the link between *problem-solving* and community policing in this large federal funding program has yielded many benefits, the linkage has also blurred the distinction between *problem-oriented policing* and community policing.

As of 2000, many police agencies in the United States and Canada,[13] and a growing number in the United Kingdom,[14] Australia, New Zealand, the Netherlands,[15] South Africa, and Scandinavia, report that they are engaged in problem-oriented policing in some fashion. A few agencies have expressly made problem-oriented policing the focal point of their long-range strategic plans.[16] A review of police agency websites, increasingly becoming a standard method of communication, finds dozens of agencies specifically citing the adoption of problem-oriented policing methods in their operations. There is no easy way to quantify the number of police agencies engaged in problem-oriented

[10] *A national process evaluation of the COPS Office reported that while community policing takes many forms among the grant recipient agencies, some form of problem-solving is occurring in most agencies (Roth and Ryan 2000).*

[11] *The Police Executive Research Forum (2000) evaluated the PSP Program, and Michigan State University Professor Tim Bynum is evaluating problem analyses conducted by 16 selected grantees. Twice during my research, I reviewed reports PSP grantees submitted to the COPS Office. I found that most of the reports provided too little information for a person unfamiliar with the particular problem to form a good understanding of it. (I do not know to what degree the quality of the reports reflected the quality of the actual work done on the problem.) By my own estimate, one generally confirmed by the other COPS Office staff members reviewing the reports, only 15 to 20 percent of the PSP reports were of good quality.*

[12] *The School-Based Partnership Program is also funded for a program evaluation to assess the impact problem-solving methods and responses had on identified problems.*

[13] *See Leighton (1994) for a description of the development of community and problem-oriented policing in Canada. See, also, Saville and Rossmo (1995) for a description of early problem-oriented policing efforts in British Columbia.*

[14] *See Leigh, Read and Tilley (1996, 1998) and Read and Tilley (2000) for descriptions of the spread of problem-oriented policing in the United Kingdom. They conclude that "problem-oriented policing is being widely considered in British police services. It appears to be an idea whose time has come" (1998:54). See, also, Bennett (1994), and Tilley (1999). Herman Goldstein has helped advance the problem-oriented policing concept in the United Kingdom through various consultations and speeches (Goldstein 1995a, 1996a).*

[15] *See Willemse (1994) for a description of the development of crime prevention principles in the Netherlands.*

[16] *The Colorado Springs, Colo., Police Department described its commitment to problem-oriented policing in a document titled Total Problem-Oriented Policing. The Lauderhill, Fla., Police Department, where the author served as the first police chief, made problem-oriented policing the organizing concept during the creation of the new agency.*

policing, much less to gauge the precise nature and quality of those efforts. However, it is safe to say that far more agencies claim to be engaged in problem-oriented policing today than at any other time.

Problem-oriented policing continues to advance across the police field, even while the adoption of problem-oriented policing into particular police agencies seldom happens in a linear fashion. Interest in the concept and commitment to its implementation rises and falls in response to many internal and external factors. Changes in leadership, competing priorities or simply inertia can alter the course of implementation. Accordingly, one might reach different conclusions about the vitality of problem-oriented policing depending on whether one was looking only at selected police agencies or at the police field as a whole.

At the risk of overlooking some exemplary efforts (and perhaps giving more credit than is due elsewhere), below is a list of the police agencies that, at one time or another, have been prominently associated with problem-oriented policing. Their prominence may have resulted from a particular person in the agency, involvement in a research effort, or publication of the agency's efforts in the professional literature. Inclusion on this list is not a testament to the depth or quality of the agency's commitment to problem-oriented policing.

Table 2
Police Agencies Prominently Associated With Problem-Oriented Policing[17]

1.	Edmonton Police Service[18]	Alberta
2.	Phoenix Police Department	Arizona
3.	Tempe Police Department	Arizona
4.	Fresno Police Department[19]	California
5.	Hayward Police Department	California
6.	Huntington Beach Police Department	California
7.	Los Angeles Police Department[20]	California
8.	Oxnard Police Department	California
9.	Sacramento Police Department	California
10.	San Diego Police Department[21]	California
11.	Santa Ana Police Department[22]	California
12.	Santa Barbara Police Department[23]	California
13.	Arvada Police Department	Colorado
14.	Aurora Police Department[24]	Colorado
15.	Colorado Springs Police Department[25]	Colorado
16.	Longmont Police Department	Colorado
17.	Cleveland Police[26]	England
18.	Lancashire Police[27]	England

[17] *Sources for this list include the files and personal knowledge of the author and Herman Goldstein; Community Policing and Problem-Solving: Strategies and Practices, by Kenneth J. Peak and Ronald W. Glensor (1996); and various other publications, some of which are footnoted.*

[18] *See Hawkins (1998), Koller (1990), Hornick et al. (1990), and Weisel and Eck (1994).*

[19] *See West (1995).*

[20] *See Goldstein (1990a) and Greene (1998a).*

[21] *See Police Executive Research Forum (1989), Bureau of Justice Assistance (1993a), and Capowich and Roehl (1994).*

[22] *See Jesilow et al. (1998).*

[23] *See Barrett (1996), and Weisel and Eck (1994).*

[24] *See Williams and Sloan (1990).*

[25] *See Kramer and McElderry (n.d.).*

[26] *See Leigh, Read and Tilley (1998).*

[27] *See Kirby (1997).*

19.	Leicestershire Police Force[28]	England
20.	London Metropolitan Police[29]	England
21.	Merseyside Police Force[30]	England
22.	Surrey Police Force	England
23.	Thames Valley Police Force	England
24.	Clearwater Police Department	Florida
25.	Delray Beach Police Department	Florida
26.	Fort Pierce Police Department	Florida
27.	Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office	Florida
28.	Lauderhill Police Department	Florida
29.	St. Petersburg Police Department	Florida
30.	Tampa Police Department[31]	Florida
31.	Atlanta Police Department[32]	Georgia
32.	Savannah Police Department[33]	Georgia
33.	Aurora Police Department	Illinois
34.	Chicago Police Department[34]	Illinois
35.	Evanston Police Department	Illinois
36.	Joliet Police Department	Illinois
37.	Wichita Police Department	Kansas
38.	Baltimore County Police Department[35]	Maryland
39.	Ann Arbor Police Department	Michigan
40.	Flint Police Department[36]	Michigan
41.	Kansas City Police Department	Missouri
42.	St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department	Missouri
43.	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department	North Carolina
44.	Lincoln Police Department	Nebraska
45.	Reno Police Department	Nevada
46.	New York City Police Department[37]	New York
47.	Suffolk County Police Department	New York
48.	Tulsa Police Department[38]	Oklahoma
49.	Halton Regional Police	Ontario
50.	Peel Regional Police	Ontario
51.	Portland Police Department	Oregon
52.	Abington Township Police Department	Pennsylvania
53.	Philadelphia Police Department[39]	Pennsylvania
54.	Stockholm Police	Sweden
55.	Austin Police Department	Texas
56.	Houston Police Department[40]	Texas
57.	Newport News Police Department[41]	Virginia
58.	Seattle Police Department	Washington
59.	Spokane Police Department	Washington
60.	Beloit Police Department	Wisconsin
61.	La Crosse Police Department	Wisconsin
62.	Madison Police Department[42]	Wisconsin

[28] *See Leigh, Read and Tilley (1996, 1998).*

[29] *See Hoare, Stewart and Purcell (1984), and Goldstein (1990a).*

[30] *See Gresty et al. (1997), and Berry (1999).*

[31] *See Police Executive Research Forum (1989) and Bureau of Justice Assistance (1993a).*

[32] *See Police Executive Research Forum (1989) and Bureau of Justice Assistance (1993a).*

[33] *See Young (1998), and Weisel and Eck (1994).*

[34] *See Skogan (1998), Skogan, et al. (1999) and Hartnett and Skogan (1999).*

[35] *See Taft (1986), Higdon and Huber (1987), and Goldstein (1990a).*

[36] *See Goldstein (1990a).*

[37] *See Goldstein (1990a), and McElroy, Cosgrove and Sadd (1993).*

[38] *See Police Executive Research Forum (1989) and Bureau of Justice Assistance (1993a).*

[39] *See Police Executive Research Forum (1989), Bureau of Justice Assistance (1993a), Weisel and Eck (1994) and Berry (1996).*

[40] *See Goldstein (1990a).*

[41] *See Eck and Spelman (1987), Weisel and Eck (1994), Babcock (1996) and Goldstein (1990a).*

[42] *See Goldstein (1990a), Couper and Lobitz (1991) and Wycoff and Skogan (1993).*

A number of the agencies listed have, for all appearances, abandoned their efforts to implement problem-oriented policing and are no longer strongly associated with the concept. In a few cases, this abandonment reflected a conscious policy decision. More commonly, the momentum for problem-oriented policing subsided due to lost interest, competing priorities or inertia. A number of other agencies not listed here have only recently sought to implement problem-oriented policing, and their efforts have not yet been widely recognized. As so many police officers, researchers and observers have noticed, when one goes to visit agencies renowned for their problem-oriented policing efforts, these visits often prove disappointing. Frequently, what once was there is no longer, or what is there proves less substantial than what one expected from distant reports.

However slow, modest and uneven the movement in problem-oriented policing has been, it is now a central part of at least the language of modern police management. If language can influence culture, as surely it can, problem-oriented policing is making inroads to the professional culture of police management and operations. The term *problem-oriented policing* itself now has an acronym–POP. The "International Conference on Problem-Oriented Policing" is more commonly referred to as the "POP Conference." Police personnel commonly refer to substantive problem-solving initiatives as "POP projects." And to capture those "POP projects," PERF has created a computerized compilation of them named "POPNet" and a private consulting firm is marketing a computer software program called "POP Track."[43] The movement has its own T-shirts and coffee mugs. The concept has even appeared in police mystery fiction,[44] as well as in British television police dramas.[45] So, too, with the term *problem-solving*. Rare in police management circles 20 years ago, it is now standard in the police lexicon. Some have called problem-oriented policing *problem-solving policing* (Moore 1998).

Along with this rise in the popularity of terms associated with problem-oriented policing has come a certain amount of distortion of its original meaning. A lot of what is presented as a "POP project" incorporates no careful study of an underlying problem, but reflects merely a programmatic effort that may or may not affect a particular community crime or disorder problem. Problem-oriented policing is sometimes described as an operational strategy itself, as in "we applied problem-oriented policing tactics to the problem." In fact, there are no distinctly problem-oriented tactics.[46] *Problem-solving,* specifically referring to an analytical process in the context of problem-oriented policing, is also used frequently to refer to methods for addressing administrative or personnel matters, or, more generally, to any mental process involving some degree of reflection before action. Accordingly, one should not assume that any use of the terms *problems,*

[43] *POP Track is a software program designed to allow police agencies to track problem-oriented policing projects and resources. It was developed and is marketed by Law Enforcement Assistance Network, a private police consulting firm headed by several police officials with experience in implementing problem-oriented policing and community policing.*

[44] *See Par Four, by Elizabeth Gunn (1998).*

[45] *An episode of the BBC program "Cops" apparently had a fictional police chief inspector invoking problem-oriented policing in an address to a community group. A critic, writing for the Manchester Guardian, apparently did not recognize problem-oriented policing, declaring it an imaginary term.*

[46] *See, for example, Klein (1998), and O'Connor, Shelley and Grant (1998), who discuss problem-oriented policing's impact on, respectively, gangs and domestic violence.*

problem-solving or *problem-oriented* in the policing context is directly connected to Goldstein's original conception of problem-oriented policing.

Some elements of Goldstein's ideal model of problem-oriented policing have been grafted onto other conceptualizations of police work and police reform. First-generation programs, projects and experiments in community policing, dating back to the late 1960s, did not explicitly incorporate a structured analytical methodology into the new forms of police work. Only in around the mid-1980s did community policing advocates begin to incorporate some elements of problem-oriented policing into that framework. Problem-oriented policing and community policing were both explored during the Executive Sessions on Community Policing held at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government that began in 1985. During this time, and partly as a result of the discussions in these sessions, problem-oriented policing began to be incorporated into the concept of community policing, an integration that has never been complete, or completely warranted.[47]

Failing to acknowledge all aspects of the problem-oriented model beyond beat-level problem-solving, some community policing advocates repackaged problem-oriented policing as a tactic, tool or method one might use within a community policing philosophy. This repackaging failed to recognize some critical differences between community and problem-oriented policing, namely, that they have different primary goals and, consequently, some different methods. Moreover, it reduced Goldstein's involved, intensive and rigorous communitywide problem analysis to more informal street-, beat- or neighborhood-level problem-solving. Other advocates of police reform introduced yet additional labels, like "neighborhood policing," that are not theoretically distinguishable from community policing.[48]

All these efforts toward concept clarification produced a variety of labels and a lot of confusion among police practitioners, much of which lingers today. To some degree, all the debate and efforts to synthesize and harmonize the different concepts reflected an intellectual battle for the high ground in police reform, with advocates' claiming each concept to be the overarching framework under which all others would be subsumed. Goldstein, at the University of Wisconsin, and PERF, in the 1980s, represented one school of thought–the problem-oriented policing school. Robert Trojanowicz and his colleagues at Michigan State University represented the community policing school of thought. Mark Moore and George Kelling, at Harvard University, sought to synthesize community policing and problem-oriented policing, drawing heavily on theories about organizational strategy. Kelling's own brand of police reform,

[47] *Goldstein himself at one time linked problem-oriented policing to community policing by characterizing the various reform concepts as falling under the larger umbrella of community policing (1987a; see, also, Brodeur 1998b), a link he has since come to reconsider and regret (1995b).*

[48] *For a more in-depth discussion of the various perspectives on community policing, see Police Executive Research Forum (1996:2-8).*

now popularized as the "broken windows theory," would later come to be seen as another school of thought. Lee Brown, then-police chief in Houston, represented the neighborhood policing school of thought. David Couper, then-police chief in Madison, was a prominent proponent of yet another school of thought–the total quality management school. Lawrence Sherman (1998) proposed "evidence-based policing" as an alternate construct for improving police service.[49] The distinctions between and among problem-oriented policing and other police reform movements, including community policing, are discussed at greater length in chapter 3.

It would itself be a great oversimplification and distortion to suggest that these schools of thought and their respective adherents were in diametrical disagreement with one another. In fact, they agreed a lot, at least about the need for improvement in policing and for improved relations between the police and the public. One can more accurately understand these schools of thought as different ways of conceptualizing some common themes. The respective schools of thought had different themes as their organizing principle and gave differing priorities to the aspects of reform they held in common. All of their views, now considered mainstream, represented the radical or reform view of policing only 20 years ago.

[49] Sherman attempts to draw a distinction between evidence-based and problem-oriented policing based on the scientific measurement standards he asserts are central to evidence-based policing and largely ignored by problem-oriented policing. The distinction is more one of degree than of kind. See chapter 1, the sections titled "What Standards of Proof Should Apply in Analyzing Problems" and "How Should the Effectiveness of Implemented Responses Be Evaluated?" for further discussion of standards of proof in problem-oriented policing.